

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/895,077	07/02/2001	Thomas V. Johnson	06502.0323	9092	
22852	7590 07/27/2005	EXAMINER			
	N, HENDERSON, FAR	GODDARD, BRIAN D			
LLP 901 NEW YO	ORK AVENUE, NW	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			2161		
		•	DATE MAILED: 07/27/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before	the	Filing	of an	Ap	peal	Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/895,077	JOHNSON ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Brian Goddard	2161			

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED <u>05 July 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. 🔯 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires ___ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _ . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). 3. 🔲 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. 🔀 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔲 will not be entered, or b) 🔀 will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5-11,13-22,25-29,31-33,37,38,41-47 and 49-53. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ___ AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other:

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. First, the examiner will not rehash old arguments addressed on pages 23-24 for the sake of brevity. Referring instead to applicants' remarks on pages 24-25 regarding the proposed amendments to claims 1, 21 and 37 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 4, 24 and 40 respectively: Applicants argued that, "Consequently, the "semantic link description" relied upon by the Examiner does not reference an instance of the EosMapElement class. Instead, it is a generic description of connections between classes of objects, that is used to initialize the semantic links." The examiner disagrees for the following reasons: Contrary to applicants' assertions, the examiner has not relied on the "semantic link description." Although Mitchell may store a semantic link description in a table, which is generic to classes and not instances, and is used to instantiate a semantic link for a specific instance, Mitchell also stores the semantic link ITSELF within the table, once instantiated, that references the instance (EosMapFieldToField (e.g. 103)) of the association class (EosMapElement) as claimed. This in fact must be done, as described within the cited portions of Mitchell, in order to set the probe when a patron object is later instantiated. The remainder of applicants' remarks substantially repeat the above argument and/or old arguments.

HOSAIN ALAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER